

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 336

PS 012 106

AUTHOR Spodek, Bernard; Mir-Janiv, Nechama
TITLE Critical Thinking Reflects (Hevra) Instruction: A Model of Supervision and Instruction Based on Reflectivity.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981).
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Cooperation; Foreign Countries; *Inservice Education; *Kindergarten; *Preschool Teachers; Primary Education; *Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Seminars; *Supervisors; *Supervisory Training
IDENTIFIERS Habermas (Jürgen); *Israel; Project HEVRA; Reflective Thinking

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on the implementation and informal evaluation of Project HEVRA--a cross-cultural inservice education program provided to supervisor/advisers of kindergarten teachers in Israel. Through inservice seminars initiated by an American consultant in conjunction with Israeli counterparts and through a series of monthly meetings, supervisor/advisers were provided with a framework for evaluating kindergarten programs. Supervisor/advisers in turn helped teachers explore their teaching practices and beliefs about these practices in small group seminars and discussions. Teachers were helped to become more reflective of their practices, to identify the theories underlying their practices and to assess the consistency of their practices with these theories. Teachers were encouraged to view kindergarten instruction as a problematic situation involving choices of alternatives, not as the implementation of a preformed, preselected program. Three HEVRA programs, formed during the period from 1977 through 1980, are described in the fourth section of the paper. Self-report evaluation data from program participants are given for each of the three programs. Favorable responses and comments suggest that the program did have an impact on how supervisor/advisers related to teachers and that the impact was in the direction intended. (Author/RH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bernard
Spodek

CRITICAL THINKING REFLECTS (HEVRA) INSTRUCTION:
A MODEL OF SUPERVISION AND INSTRUCTION
BASED ON REFLECTIVITY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Bernard Spodek, Ed.D.
Professor of Early Childhood
Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Nechama Nir-Janiv, Ed.D.
Director of Early Childhood
Education
Ministry of Education and
Culture, and
Bar Ilan University
Israel

Introduction

Kindergartens in Israel are under the supervision of the Ministry of Education and Culture. Although supported by funds coming from both the local municipality and the central ministry, the responsibility for the curriculum and the quality of teaching in the classrooms rests primarily with the ministry. This responsibility is met through the use of supervisors who work directly with the kindergarten teachers. Supervisors operate much like the Her Majesty's Inspectors in the English school system. They are employed by the Ministry and are directly responsible to the Director of Early Childhood Education. Each supervisor is responsible for a given number of kindergarten teachers. The supervisors observe teachers in action, suggesting program elements, teaching methods and educational content that they consider to be appropriate for the children in each kindergarten.

Kindergartens in Israel have been used to serve many educational and social purposes (Nir-Janiv & Spodek, 1979). Generally, the method for communicating and establishing innovative programs as well as for improving existing programs has been with ministry suggestions communicated through the supervisors to the kindergarten teachers. This has led to the development of a top-down approach to curriculum development, that is, curriculum emanating from the central office being handed fully formed to the teachers by way of the supervisory process.

In order to decrease the supervisory load, kindergarten teachers have been used in a role similar to that of the supervisor. These advisers, as they are called, have much the same responsibility for supervising kindergartens as do the supervisors, although they may not have the same degree of authority. The ratio of supervisors/advisers to kindergarten teachers in Israel is approximately 1:130, although in the poorer areas this ratio has been reduced to 1:50.

The teachers' role was seen essentially as that of helping children grow, preparing them for later school, for future life, and for good citizenship. The child is the center of educational concern; the school

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, American Educational Research
Association, Los Angeles, California, April, 1981

ED200336

PS012106

is his arena. Most teaching in the kindergarten is indirect, with the teacher preparing the props and activities that are considered desirable to support the child's healthy development. The supervisor supports the teacher indirectly focusing essentially on classroom practice in much the same manner as the teacher supports the child. The traditional concept of supervision used in the system has been based on helping individual teachers with their educational problems through individual consultation. As the role of the kindergarten teacher changed over time, this method of supervision has proved to be inadequate.

More recently, the concern for kindergarten education has shifted from a primary concern for the child to an appreciation of the centrality of the family in the life and education of the child. Parents began to be seen as legitimate clients of the kindergarten teacher along with the child. A number of early educational programs in Israel, including HIPPIE (Lombard, 1980) and KEDMA (Nir-Janiv & Jick, 1973) have provided models that include parents as clients in the educational enterprise of the kindergarten.

Working with parents required teachers to develop new competencies as well as new educational strategies, demanding that they work outside the conventional arena of the kindergarten classroom. Supervisors had to help teachers become leaders of adults as well as guides for children, thus extending their own roles and responsibilities as well as those of the teachers.

During this same time, major changes were occurring in the content of the kindergarten program. The curriculum reform movement that impacted on the United States in the 1960's also impacted on Israeli education. The hypothesis presented by Bruner (1960) that "any subject can be taught to any child at any level of development in an intellectually honest way" led to revision of school programs related to the structure of various academic disciplines. Just as proposals were offered for revision in kindergarten programs in the United States (e.g., Robison and Spodek, 1965), so new kindergarten programs were developed in Israel.

In addition to this, there has been the commitment in Israel to appropriately educate all children from every cultural background and from every social strata. Educational materials were redesigned to reflect the backgrounds of the children involved in school. Programs were used to socialize the large number of children and their families settling in Israel from countries all over the world, many of them with cultural backgrounds far different from that of the mainstream Israeli.

The new demands and responsibilities placed upon the kindergartens created a need for change, often at a pace much greater than that expected of teachers and schools in other countries. Requiring teachers to return to their teacher education institution for continuing education was seen as inappropriate, both because the teachers would still need to be responsible for their classes and because the teacher training institutions were seen as primarily preservice oriented. Thus, the responsibility for the continuing education of teachers was to fall

primarily upon the supervisors. The ability of the top-down consultation model to effect teachers classroom practices and its consistency with the educational philosophy of the kindergarten was questioned.

Project Hevra - The Program

In the Spring of 1977, Dr. Nechama Nir-Janiv spent several weeks at the University of Illinois as a Visiting Scholar working with Professor Bernard Spodek. During that period the plan for the project with supervisors was originally conceived. Professor Spodek was invited to Israel in September of that year, where he conducted a two-week seminar with supervisors who had volunteered to participate in the program. This group, which was called Hevra "A", continued to meet monthly with Dr. Nir-Janiv for the bulk of that school year and, at their request, for the next two years as well. Follow-up seminars were held with Professor Spodek in November of 1978. A second group, Hevra "B", was organized in November, 1978 and again began their involvement with a two week seminar with Professor Spodek, continuing throughout that and the next year with monthly meetings with Dr. Nir-Janiv. In the fall of 1979, a third group, Hevra "C", was started working solely with Dr. Nir-Janiv.

The composition of each group varied somewhat from one another. Hevra "A" consisted of 22 supervisors and advisers who volunteered for the program. The group stayed intact during their second year, while in the third year, 6 participants dropped out. (Two of them had left their jobs, and the other four had other conflicting commitments.)

Hevra "B" consisted of 30 supervisors and advisers. This was generally a younger, less experienced group and, of the thirty, only 4 were supervisors. The third group consisted of thirty-five supervisors and advisers, thus demonstrating an increasing willingness of the supervisory group to voluntarily participate in the project. This group contained some of the most experienced and successful kindergarten supervisors in the ministry. Each of the supervisors committed themselves, not only to attending the seminars and participating in the monthly meetings, but also to working with a group of about ten to fifteen kindergarten teachers in a manner suggested by the seminars and workshops. Thus, the participants in Hevra A worked with about 250 kindergarten teachers, those in Hevra B worked with about 400 teachers, and those in Hevra C with about 450 teachers.

The primary focus of the two-week seminars was helping supervisors and teachers learn to evaluate kindergarten programs based upon the response to three questions: "Is what is taught to the child developmentally appropriate? Is what is taught to the child worth knowing? Is what is taught to the child testable by the child?" (Spodek, 1977). Evaluation related to the first question was most familiar to the group since early childhood programs have always been seen as closely related to developmental theory. The supervisors were able to explore basic developmental concepts related to different approaches and their implications for programs. Evaluation related to the second question

was based upon an exploration of the values deemed appropriate and desirable in Israeli culture and the relationship of school practices to these values. Evaluation related to the third question was probably the most remote from the backgrounds of these supervisors. It required an exploration of the nature of knowledge and attempt to begin to understand how children come to know what they know, how they generate and validate knowledge. Finally, an attempt was made to understand how kindergarten practices were related simultaneously to all three of these areas.

The second part of the seminar was related to helping supervisors and advisers look at the consistency of what they do with what they want teachers to do. Questions that were explored in the seminar related to how kindergarten teachers come to know what they know about children, programs and educational methods. Just as the ideological basis of different kindergarten programs were explored relating the above three questions, so the ideological basis of supervisory practice was explored.

As a result of these explorations the supervisors and advisers agreed to try to work with a small group of kindergarten teachers in a somewhat different way. The focus of this work was to help teachers explore their own practice, and their own beliefs about practice in small group seminars and discussions. Teachers were helped to become more reflective of their practice, attempting to identify the underlying theory, implicit or explicit, by which they worked, and to begin to evaluate the consistency or inconsistency of their practice with their theory. The focus of the explorations was to be the development of teacher autonomy, that is, teachers becoming more responsible for their actions and for understanding the reasons for their actions. The group process was used both to reflect back on what teachers have said about what they did and what they believed, as well as to form a support group that would give teachers some security for innovating as well as creating a community of beliefs about kindergarten practices as a result of a developing consensus. Thus, reflectivity was seen as the foundation of teacher development.

Reflectivity

The idea of reflectivity underlying this project is rooted in a number of sources. The central thesis is that, in order to create a form of curriculum development that would support a democratic ethic, teachers must be dealt with in a democratic manner. They must be involved in selecting and creating curriculum activities and the process of selection and creation must be reasoned process. Thus, not only must the teachers have a role in choosing activities rather than activities prescribed for them by others, but the process of choosing in which they engage must help the teachers become aware of the criteria for making these choices and help them use these criteria appropriately. The teacher can no longer be dependent on the supervisor or adviser's judgement. They must also be aware that in creating curriculum they are choosing from among alternatives, and that their choice should be consistent with the goals they have established for their children.

Dewey (1910) defined reflective thought as thought in which the basis for a belief is deliberately sought and the adequacy of that basis to support the belief examined. Thus, as teachers examine what they believe to be true about classroom activities, they engage in reflective thinking. In order to support their beliefs about activities they must examine, for example, whether the activities result in valued consequences. Evidence about the outcomes of activities could be collected through classroom observation of children. In order to do this, teachers need to be clear about what outcomes they expect and desire for their children. In this case, the process of reflective thinking is not a passive one, but requires activity in the form of providing educational services to children and collecting information about the consequences of those services as well as reflecting or judging the information gathered and relating consequences to goals. Since in most kindergartens, there are no other educational personnel available continually to support this activity, the total burden of choosing, teaching, observing and judging falls on the kindergarten teacher. The supervisor who comes around periodically can, at best, serve as a resource. In addition to the practical worth of reflective thinking, helping teachers become more aware of the process of judging and choosing also helps the teachers become more independent, not only in their provision of service but in the decision-making process as well.

The process of reflective thinking is designed to solve problems or find the meaning to a perplexing situation. To suggest that teachers engage in reflective thinking related to their classrooms is to suggest that the education of young children should be considered problematic to teachers. Working with young children is not simply a matter of implementing a program model, a course of study, or a set of activities that has been handed to the teacher by some outside authority. Teachers must consider the classroom as representing a situation in which there are alternative solutions from which she may choose. They need to view the kindergarten as often creating dilemmas for them in which there is no single right or wrong way to act or a single proper set of activities to implement. Instead, the situation is one in which there are a number of values operating, often in conflict with one another.

In order for teachers to become more reflective in their classroom, they have to deal with more than the immediate practical aspects of teaching. It is not that the practical aspects should be avoided, but a concern for them needs to be placed in a framework of some simple or elaborate theory. Without some form of theory a teacher's response to a situation may or may not work, but the teacher will never be able to speculate about the causes of immediate success or failure. Without such speculation about causes, the teacher's only response to new problems is to respond exactly as they have to previously encountered problems, since there has no basis for determining the essential characteristics of the original response or the critical elements of the problematic situation.

Thus, supervisors concerned with developing self-reflection among teachers must be concerned with the theoretical as well as the practical aspects of teaching and with the relationship of theory to practice.

This does not mean that teachers need to focus on the elaborate educational or developmental theory with which to justify their practical reactions to day to day classroom experience, but rather that teachers must be helped to see the regularities with which they respond to classroom situations, deriving rules from these regularities and assessing the validity of the rules developed and the way in which the rules are implemented. To the extent that formal developmental or educational theories help in this task, they are supportive of reflective teachers. To the extent that they hinder, by causing the teacher to distance theoretical speculation from practical activity, they should be avoided.

Another concern for self-reflection in teachers arises out of the work of Jurgan Habermas. Habermas (1971) proposes that knowledge cannot be divorced from human interests. Different forms of human knowledge are related to different interests. Scientific knowledge growing out of an empirical-analytic framework is grounded in a technical cognitive interest in control. This form of knowledge is concerned with the abstraction of fact from value and the creation of theory explaining facts. Hermeneutic knowledge is concerned with understanding the meanings that arise out of cultural life and are related to a practical cognitive interest in consensus. Underlying the self-reflective sciences which transcend the problems of scientism and objectivism is a critical cognitive interest in liberation or emancipation. Habermas views psychoanalysis an example of a self-reflective approach that transcends science and is concerned with personal emancipation.

By helping the teacher become aware of the forms of knowledge on which the school curriculum is embedded and seeing that each form has its own process of validation, teachers are better able to make valid judgments about program content. Empirical outcome data might be useful for validating some educational achievement, but it is not valid for all forms of achievement. Achieving objectivity in studying some aspects of the teachers' and children's relationship to school may be valid, but it is not valid for all aspects of these relationships. Teachers in the kindergarten are concerned, for example, with the socialization of children. That part of the curriculum concerned with socialization is embedded in hermeneutical-historical knowledge. Aspects of the sciences, mathematics and social studies curriculum are embedded in empirical-analytic knowledge. Aspects of the curriculum concerned with autonomy are embedded in the self-reflective sciences. The same topic may include a concern for all three types of knowledge.

Teachers must develop all three kinds of knowledge as they come to understand their professional role. Knowledge concerned with the technical aspects of education must become aware of empirical-analytic knowledge that has been generated. This is knowledge that grows out of learning theory, developmental theory and empirical research. Knowledge of professional identity and the community of education is hermeneutic knowledge. Self-reflective knowledge is knowledge that teachers use in the acts of judging and choosing those elements they will incorporate into their children's programs.

Just as the curriculum reflects these different forms of knowledge, so must the approach to teacher training. Teachers will not become more autonomous because they are technically more proficient. Teachers become autonomous as a result of self-reflection. The Deweyian conception of self-reflection, in this instance is equally as important as a concern for teachers' personal feelings. It is in the merging of the affective and cognitive interests in emancipation that teachers autonomy can be properly addressed.

The Treatment

HEVRA A

The nature of the monthly meetings of the supervisors varied from year to year and from group to group depending upon their interests and their own developmental level as supervisors. During the first year of HEVRA A (1977-78), ten monthly meetings were held. The first meeting was concerned with the idea of critical thinking as postulated by Shlomo Arshevsky, an Israeli scholar who died in the sixties. In his book, The Education of Thought (1958), Arshevsky defines critical thinking as a process that deals with the criticism and testing of ideas and ideals. Three functions characterized critical thinking: (1) examining a chain of proofs in order to verify its logical validity; (2) reaching a consensus in the interpretation of proofs and ideas; and (3) creating new ideas that are clearer, more logical and more relevant.

The group focused on the testing and clarification of ideas in order to reach group consensus among the supervisors and advisers. Through this testing and consensus-making, the group attempted to identify and bridge the gap between ideas and deeds, and between goals and activities manifest in teaching and in supervisory practice relating to kindergartens. This exploration was possible as a result of a climate of trust and sincerity within the group. The idea of critical thinking in program development was seen as counter to influencing practice through status relationships, and through power relationships that forced propaganda on others. Thus, a more responsive relationship could be established between supervisors and teachers, between teachers and parents, and between teachers and children as a way of influencing the thoughts and actions of others.

During the second year of HEVRA A (1978-79), the group focused on the topic of play as a learning medium. Dr. Nir-Janiv had returned from teaching a course on play in early childhood education at the University of Illinois during that summer. Since the topic of play was receiving increased attention in the field, it was deemed that this would be a useful vehicle for further development in the group. Supervisors met monthly, analyzing various theories of play and their implications for kindergarten practice. A number of Israeli specialists on child play were also invited to the sessions to share their thoughts.

Although the group was not originally scheduled to continue beyond the second year, a third year of group meetings was scheduled at

the request of participants. The third year continued the focus of the previous year's topic by having the group jointly visit kindergartens and observing and analyzing play. An observation scheme was developed by the group based upon the past year's discussion of play and early education. The schedule contained the following elements:

Mapping play settings - Availability of space, props, time.

Creation of play groupings - The spontaneous creation and dissolution of play groups; the mobility of children within and between groups, the age and sex composition of groups.

Quality of play as a worthwhile activity

Teacher planning - setting of goals, facilitating activities, providing props.

Teacher interaction with children in play - verbal and nonverbal interaction.

Multifaceted role of the teacher - How she plans, promotes learning, advises children, acts as an observer, and evaluates children's play.

The final four weeks of the program were concerned with reviewing theories of supervision. A new book on supervision, Educational-Administrative Deliberation, by two Israeli educators, Moshe Kaspi and Dan Inbar (1979), became the final focus of the sessions. The substance of the book was closely related to concerns for reflectivity and critical thinking and thus it helped in viewing the decisions that supervisors must make related to children's, teachers', and supervisors' relationships and to the goals, methods and content of educational environments with which we are concerned.

HEVRA B

Starting in November 1978, a second group of supervisors and advisers volunteered for a similar experience. Again the group began with a two week seminar with Professor Spodek as did the earlier group. Because this group was different from the first, on the whole younger and less experienced, the monthly meetings that followed took a different direction than had those in the first year of the first group. Their role as facilitators and mediators of educational programs and methods became the focus for these participants. The professional image and self concept of the adviser and supervisor was discussed as was the impact of the individual personality of adviser and supervisor on the teachers with whom they work. Blumberg's concept of supervision as interpersonal intervention (1974) was presented and its implications were explored through simulation and role playing, whereby situations were presented and the problems and concerns that became manifest were probed and analyzed to help participants gain their meanings from this. As with the first wave, meetings were also held with the teachers who were engaged by the supervisors and advisers in the program.

In the second year of this group's existence (1979-80), ten monthly meetings were again held. Two of these meetings were visits to kindergartens where the teacher-adviser relationship was observed and the influence of the adviser on the teacher's performance was analyzed. Discussion of these visits continued in later sessions. Sessions were also planned for the participants to deal with ways of becoming flexible in their own methods of working with teachers, and of modifying supervisory strategies that seem to be ineffective.

HEVRA C

In the fall of 1979-80 the third group of volunteer supervisors and advisers began their meetings, this time without the initial seminar with Professor Spodek. In the initial meetings an attempt was made to share with these teachers the ideas about kindergarten curriculum and about reflectivity and critical thinking that had been developed with the other two groups. At this writing, the group was still working on the year's activity and the total range of experiences had not been provided. In the meantime there have been requests for a fourth group, which would become HEVRA D if it is established.

Evaluation

Evaluation of the HEVRA program was on a self-report basis. The program was different each year of each group as well as for each group. It was difficult, therefore, to arrive at a common set of dimensions upon which to evaluate outcomes. For each group, therefore, a questionnaire was developed relating to the particular thrust of that group for that year. Participants were also provided with opportunities to react in an open-ended manner to the program.

One outcome that was common for all three groups was the high level of satisfaction. This was manifest by the regular attendance of the participants at all HEVRA sessions, by the desire of the HEVRA groups to continue from year to year, and by the growth of interest in the project among supervisors and advisers that were not involved. Thus not only were two groups created in the first two years, but another group was started on the third year, and requests were received for the creation of a fourth group from among the remaining supervisors and advisers.

HEVAR A

The responses of the supervisors/advisers and the teachers with whom they worked are presented in Table I. There is a consistency in the responses of the two groups in terms of the categories which received the highest responses. These related to critical thinking, mutual learning and cooperation, openness and trust and relating goals and activities.

The responses of the supervisors to the second year of HEVRA A is presented in Table II. No comparable data were collected from the teachers during this year, either in HEVRA A or HEVRA B. The four items that received the highest number of responses from the second year HEVRA A participants were increased self-knowledge, improved knowledge of teachers, openness, trust and truthfulness of the meetings, and the sense of shared problems.

A questionnaire was also administered to the HEVRA B group at the end of their first year. The responses to this questionnaire are presented in Table III. The items receiving the highest number of responses on that questionnaire were openness, warmth and truthfulness of discussions, provided the power to face difficult situations, developed flexibility, tolerance and understanding of teachers, and discussions after kindergarten sessions. (In this latter response, an activity rather than a goal was seen as particularly important.)

Participants in HEVRA B were also asked about their disappointment in the project. One response for each of the following items was received: not enough theory, wished for more simulation, more opportunities for implementation, more meetings (biweekly), a smaller group, and more visits to kindergartens. In addition to the responses tabulated from the questionnaires, participants in HEVRA A and B were provided with opportunities to respond freely to the subject. The following is a sample of the responses that were submitted.

HEVRA A - Year 1

Comments of Supervisors and Advisers*

The year of HEVRA has opened new horizons for me. I discovered that many educational concepts and slogans are misleading. I started to believe that there is a gap between what I believed I was doing and my actual performance.

The greatest contribution was the atmosphere of trust, openness and sincerity that characterized our group. The mutual learning was very meaningful to me.

HEVRA helped to create a new relationship between the teachers and myself. We all became more confident in our-selves, I became more appreciative of teachers' needs.

HEVRA made me stronger. I learned to cope with difficult problems. Most important the interactions in the small group of teachers with which I worked created an atmosphere of openness and trust. I felt that it was legitimate to express both failure and success. This was great.

*Since these comments were originally in Hebrew, they have been translated to convey the respondents' meanings.

Table I

Question: What has HEVRA contributed to your development?

<u>Teachers (N-178)</u>		<u>Supervisors (N-22)</u>	
No. of Responses	Response	No. of Responses	Response
139	Critical thinking	13	Relating goals and activities
134	Mutual learning and cooperation	13	Mutual learning and cooperation
132	Trust and openness	12	Critical thinking
127	Relating goals and activities	12	Trust and openness
123	Relevancy	11	Improving relations between supervisor and teachers
123	Improved relationship between supervisor and teacher	11	Feeling of belonging to a group
122	Improve teachers' work	10	Intellectual enrichment
104	Miscellaneous responses	8	Informality
		7	New view of teachers
		11	Miscellaneous responses

Table II
Evaluation of HEVRA A, Year II

Question: What has HEVRA contributed to you?

Supervisors and Advisers (N-28)

No. of Responses	Responses
25	Self-knowledge
25	Improved knowledge of teachers
23	Openness, trust and truthfulness of meetings
22	A sense of shared problems
20	Legitimation of failure and error
16	Freedom to express personal feelings and unconventional ideas
15	Developed a belief in teachers
14	Developed a belief in democratic leadership
14	Critical thinking and constructive criticism

Table III
Evaluation of HEVRA B

Question: What has HEVRA contributed to your development?

Supervisors (N-28)

No. of Responses	Response
25	Openness, warmth, and truthfulness of the discussions
24	Provided the power to face difficult problems at work
20	Flexibility, tolerance and understanding of teachers
18	Discussions after visiting kindergarten
10	Critical thinking
10	Reinforcement and encouragement
6	Divergent thinking
4	Increased enthusiasm for work
3	Sense of acceptance

The sharp, clear analysis of the problems in our work was the greatest contribution of HEVRA. The theory expounded and its relationship to our daily struggles was meaningful to me. I have never felt as close to the teachers with whom I work and I think they have never felt as close to me.

HEVRA B

Comments of Supervisors and Advisers*

HEVRA helped me clarify both old and new ideas. It made me aware of the teachers' and my own stages of development. Within the supportive atmosphere of the group, the teachers had the courage to express their mistakes and achievements freely. They became aware that my criticism was constructive and informative rather than judgemental. I improved as a person as a result of the discussions held among supervisors and advisers.

One of the most important things I have learned from HEVRA is the sense of freedom from stress and freedom to choose. I began to identify my own priorities gained from examining a variety of viewpoints. I learned that trust, sincerity and fairness are important in working with teachers. I learned that although education is a slow process, it requires hard work along with tolerance and patience.

I learned to criticize constructively in HEVRA. It seemed that trust, openness, truth and courage are the best ways to relate to people. I feel like a member of a family with the advisers and supervisors as sisters, thinking together, and criticizing each other with love.

I became aware that we had become a real team. We speak together, without fear of negative criticism. I always felt alone on my job; now I feel a member of a group with whom I can share everything. I feel that belief in one's fellow man and in teachers' potentialities is the basis of human relationship. It is important to give up arbitrary, unjustified and external authority to become a democratic leader.

As a result of the HEVRA meetings, I have become more enthusiastic about my work.

Conclusions

Any conclusions arrived at from this project need to be tempered by the limitations of cross-national research as well as the limitations of

*Since these comments were originally in Hebrew, they have been translated to convey the respondents' meanings.

working within the context of a practice-oriented situation. The original intent of the project, for example, was to collect data on teachers and supervisors on the impact of the project through the administration of questionnaires. The original questionnaires were developed by the two authors of this paper in English and then translated into Hebrew. These were later retranslated into English and modification of the language was made before the final Hebrew version was composed. Teachers and supervisors completed their questionnaires in Hebrew. The completed questionnaires were returned to the United States where the responses were to be translated into English, coded and tallied. Problems of translation created one difficulty since the person originally hired to do the translations was a Hebrew classicist who could not translate Hebrew "Pedagogue" into English "Pedagogue." Another problem later arose when the second administration of questionnaires was not collected from teachers in time to take back to the United States at the end of one of the author's stay in Israel.

Problems also arose in working with the group of supervisors and advisers. While one of the authors of this paper did an exceptionally sensitive job of translating from English to Hebrew for the other, the lack of fluency in Hebrew was always a barrier in the American author's work with the teachers. In spite of this barrier, teachers and supervisors were exceedingly welcoming, responsive, helpful and accepting of this cultural disadvantage.

Problems of distance compounded the problems of language. The distance separating the two authors meant that collaboration was limited to widely spaced meetings together and to often delayed interchanges by mail. The limits of the treatments were also a function of distance since one author could only be with the supervisors and advisers for two-week periods for HEVRA A and B, and not at all for HEVRA C. Contacts with the supervisors were continued by the second author on a monthly basis. There is evidence of consistency of philosophic approach within the contacts of the two authors, even though there were stylistic differences as well as differences in content of seminars. Limits on the financial resources of the program also limited both the treatments offered and the kind of data collected.

The data collected in the project were primarily self-reports and, to some extent, impressionistic statement. No attempt was made to monitor the encounters that supervisors and advisers had with their teachers, nor was there any "hard" outcome data collected on supervisors, advisers, or teachers. Thus, any conclusion about the success of the project has to rest on statements that the projects immediate clients made.

What is important here, however, is that the supervisors and advisers felt good about their involvement in the project and that the vast majority of them actually asked to continue the seminars well beyond the conclusion of the project. In addition, other supervisors asked to be included in parallel programs. This suggests that statement of positive effect was communicated not only to the researchers but to others not directly involved in the program and represent authentic feelings.

Given these limitations, the information collected in the questionnaires and the comments written by the supervisors suggest that the form of inservice education provided to supervisors in this project did have an impact on them and on how they related to teachers and that the impact was in the direction hoped for in establishing the program. It would be helpful if, in the future, the interactions of these supervisors with kindergarten teachers could be observed to see if an external observer would view these interactions in the same way as the supervisors do. It would also be interesting to see if the interactions have been generalized beyond the small group each supervisor agreed to work with for the project. Important also would be some attempt to note whether kindergarten teachers who are dealt with in the fashion suggested do become more self-reflective in their practice and more autonomous.

The problems of in-service education are problems that are not limited to national borders. Too often in the United States, for example, kindergarten teachers receive little or no supervision and what supervision is provided has little relationship to what goes on in the classroom. Often the in-service education of teachers is relegated to a few in-service days in which a cafeteria offering of workshops is provided by a local school district and in which the concerns of a single grade level of teachers may have to be submerged to the needs of the larger number. This form of in-service education lacks the continuity and ongoingness that can be provided when it is embedded in supervision.

Project HEVRA was an attempt to provide in-service education to teachers through the supervisory process. It also attempted to relate supervisors and advisers to kindergarten teachers in a way that might relieve some of the isolation of both supervisors and kindergarten teachers. The sense of purpose, the opportunities to gather together, and the freedom to express ideas and findings did help to create a feeling of a "hevra" in among the participants. There was a feeling of comradeship and collegueship that transcended the professional atmosphere of the project. This, too, was a valuable contribution.

References

- Arshevsky, S. The education of thought. 1958,
- Blumberg, A. Supervisors and teachers: a private cold war. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutcheon, 1974.
- Bruner, J.S. The process of education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Habermas, J. Knowledge and human interest. (Trans. J.J. Shapiro). Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.
- Lombard, A. HIPPY: a home instructional program for preschool youngsters. Paper presented at the International Congress on Early Childhood Education, Tel Aviv, January, 1980.
- Kaspi, H. & Inbar, D. Educational-administrative deliberation. 1979,
- Nir-Janiv, N. & Jick, T. KEDMA: Parent-teacher discussion groups. Research Report No. 172. Jerusalem: Henrietta Szold Institute, 1973.
- Nir-Janiv, N. & Spodek, B. Kindergartens in Israel. Childhood Education, 1979, 56 (2), 100-105.
- Robison, H.F. & Spodek, B. New directions in the kindergarten. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.
- Spodek, B. What constitutes worthwhile educational activities for young children? In B. Spodek (ed.), Teaching practices, re-examining assumptions. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1977.